

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/015,469

Applicant(s)

KINGSTON, HOWARD M.

Examiner

Arlen Soderquist

Art Unit

1743

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist.

(3) _____.

(2) Arnold B. Silverman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 November 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Called Mr. Silverman to inform him of a problem in this application and the action which the office would take as a result of the problem. The problem is that on August 22, 2000 a CPA request was filed and granted in this application. Since the CPA was filed after May 29, 2000, the application became subject to the constraints of the Inventors Protection act of 2000. Under the changes of this act an application having a filing date after May 29, 2000 cannot be refiled as a CPA. Requests for a CPA are to be treated as requests for continued examination (RCE) if they met the requirements for the RCE. On April 3, 2001 a request for a CPA was filed and processed as a request for continued examination. The RCE request requires a response to the outstanding office action as part of the request for continued examination. The April 3, 2001 CPA request did not have a proper response to the outstanding office action and was therefore not a proper request for continued examination. As such the application became abandoned on April 3, 2001. Applicant needs to file a petition to revive the instant application. For assistance with this, applicant was referred to Brian Hearn. Applicant was also informed that an interview summary would be prepared and sent with the notice of abandonment.